

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the following remarks are responsive to the office action dated March 20, 2003. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 23, and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-55 remain pending. New claims 56-58 have been added. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under U.S.C. §102(b)

1. Claims 1-4, 7, 14-18, 23-25, 28, 35-36, 39, and 46-55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Laflin et al. (US Patent Number 5,705,995).

Regarding Claim 1:

Claim 1 recites:

A method for operating a wireless communication device having a display screen, comprising:
identifying a string entity within a message entity;
automatically identifying a predetermined class to which the string entity belongs, from a plurality of predetermined classes;
automatically finding a contact identifier associated with the string entity and the predetermined class;
displaying descriptive information relating to the found contact identifier on the display screen; and
providing an *option to allow a user of the wireless communication device to reply to the message entity*.
(Emphasis added).

Laflin discloses a selective call *receiver* such as a pager (44), *sorts and stores* received messages (24-32) by categories, and optionally by subcategories as well (see Abstract). Laflin also discloses a pager to generate an audible alert and/or a visual stimulus that signifies the

receipt of a message that has been identified as belonging to a particular category or sub-category such as sports, family, or business. When the user is alerted, *the user may then choose to display* the received message (in Column 2, line 32 to Column 4, line 25, and in Column 6, lines 8-40). To accomplish the foregoing, Laflin discloses finding a match associated with numeric or alphabetic text within the message for the purpose of identifying and storing the data within the pager's memory (see Column 4, lines 43 -67).

Laflin also discloses if the message includes a telephone number, the entire message becomes *stored* in the pager's message memory. Laflin discloses if the message included a statement, such as "call me, Pam," that statement would be *stored* under the broad category of "business" (see Column 8, lines 26-42). However, Laflin does not teach or suggest that the user is able to reply.

Therefore, Laflin does not teach or suggest "providing an *option to allow a user* of the wireless communication device *to reply to the message entity*."

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 1 and all claims that depend on it are patentable over Laflin.

Regarding Claim 23:

Claim 23 as amended recites:

A machine readable medium having stored therein instructions for use in a wireless communication device having a display screen, the instructions comprising:
instructions to identify a string entity within a message entity;
instructions to automatically identify a predetermined class to which the string entity belongs, from a plurality of predetermined classes;
instructions to find a contact identifier associated with the string entity and the predetermined class;
instructions to generate a screen display presentation relating to the found contact identifier associated with the predetermined class; and

instructions to *configure* the wireless device in response to identification of the found contact identifier associated with the predetermined class.
(Emphasis added).

Laflin discloses allowing a user to control various functions of a pager, after receiving a message, by actuating buttons entitled Read 72, Select 74, Next 76, and Previous 78 (in Column 4, lines 31 to 42). The user is allowed to actuate the buttons in response to message categories or to read the next portion of a message (in Column 9 lines 24 to 67, and Column 10 lines 1 to 60). However, Laflin does not teach or suggest “instructions to *configure* the wireless device in response to identification of the found contact identifier associated with the predetermined class.” Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 23 and all claims that depend on it are patentable over Laflin.

Regarding Claim 35:

Claim 35 includes limitations similar to those in claim 1 discussed above. Specifically, Laflin does not teach or suggest to “provide an *option to allow a user* of the wireless communication device *to reply to the message entity*.”

Therefore, claim 35 and all claims that depend on it are patentable over Laflin for similar reasons.

Rejections under U.S.C. §103(a)

2. Claims 5-6, 26-27 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laflin et al. (US Patent Number 5,705,995) in view of Dahm et al. (US Patent Number 6,301,471).

Claims 5-6, 26-27 and 37-38 include the limitations of the claims they depend upon and are thus patentable based on the limitations as discussed above for the associated claim 1, 23, or

35. Applicants therefore submit that claims 5-6, 26-27 and 37-38 are patentable over Laflin and Dahm.

In addition, Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Dahm to Laflin so that a network server device is capable of including a connection mechanism between a wireless carrier and wired network (Office Action, page 6). However, neither Laflin nor Dahm addresses a problem or provides a solution for the connection mechanism between a wireless carrier and wired network. Dahm addresses the problem of mobile *subscriber churning*, while Laflin addresses a completely different problem i.e., sorting and storing received pager messages. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Laflin and Dahm. Applicants therefore submit that claims 5-6, 26-27 and 37-38 are patentable over Laflin with Dahm.

3. Claims 8-11, 19-22, 29-32, and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laflin et al. (US Patent Number 5,705,995) in view of Gershman et al. (US Patent Number 6,401,085).

Claims 8-11, 19-22, 29-32, and 40-43 include the limitations of the claims they depend upon and are thus patentable based on the limitations as discussed above for the associated claim 1, 23, or 35. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 8-11, 19-22, 29-32, and 40-43 are patentable over Laflin and Gershman.

In addition, Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Gershman to Laflin so that a network server device is capable of including a connection mechanism between a wireless carrier and wired network (Office Action, page 7). However, neither Laflin nor Gershman addresses a

problem or provides a solution for the connection mechanism between a wireless carrier and wired network. Gershman addresses the problem of obtaining product information for a user from the Internet after the user makes a request for that information, while Laflin addresses a completely different problem i.e., sorting and storing received pager messages. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Laflin with Gershman. Applicants therefore submit that claims 8-11, 19-22, 29-32, and 40-43 are patentable over Laflin and Gershman.

Also, regarding claims 19-22, Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Gershman to Laflin so that the wireless communication device should be easy to use in the environment and under the conditions in which consumers find themselves desiring to use the device. However, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Laflin with Gershman as explained above. Applicants therefore submit that claims 19-22 are patentable over Gershman and Laflin.

4. Claims 12-13, 24, 33-34, and 44-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laflin et al. (US Patent Number 5,705,995) in view of Tomimori (US Patent Number 6,456,841).

Claims 12-13, 24, 33-34, and 44-45 include the limitations of the claims they depend upon and are thus patentable based on the limitations as discussed above for the associated claim 1, 23, or 35. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 12-13, 24, 33-34, and 44-45 are patentable over Laflin and Tomimori.

In addition, Examiner asserts it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Tomimori to Laflin so that user recognizes a kind of contact identifiers by symbolic (Office Action, pages 8 and 9). However,

Tomimori addresses the problem of inconvenience to a user required to refer to a manual to access stored voice messages, while Laflin address a completely different problem i.e., sorting and storing received pager messages. Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Tomimori and Laflin. Applicants therefore submit that claims 12-13, 24, 33-34, and 44-45 are patentable over the Tomimori and Laflin.


In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges not covered by any checks submitted, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: _____

5/1/03


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

12400 Wilshire Boulevard,
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300